

Lombard	LBRDILLMDS1	X	X
Lemont North	LEMTILLED0	X	X
North Chicago	NCHCILNCDS0	X	
Roselle	RSLILRZDS0	X	X
Wheaton	WHTNILWHDS0	X	X
Arlington Hts.	ARLHILAHDS0	X	X
Aurora-Main	AURRILARDS0	X	X
Barrington-S.	BNTOLAGDS0	X	X
Lockport	LCPTILLPDS0	X	X
Summit	SMMTILSMDS0	X	X

All other offices are currently capable of providing the requested OS/DA routing. However, as stated previously in Ameritech's February 6 and March 10, 1997 letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition, as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time. As explained to you in the letter from Ray Thomas dated February 24 and stated again in the March 10 letter. Ameritech generally does not require a BFR for requests for custom routing in conjunction with ULS that involves 25 or less line class codes. Ameritech will advise you of any case with a custom routing request for ULS that is not technically feasible, or will require special construction.

As stated in your March 10 letter from me, should AT&T submit a BFR order for OS/DA routing to AT&T's OS/DA platform where an existing switch lacks the capacity or capability to provide the routing without software upgrades or construction of additional switching capacity, Ameritech will provide an estimate of the cost to undertake any technically feasible alternative made available by the specific switch vendor, short of complete switch replacement.

There are no additional costs with this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.



Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill



April 3, 1997

Ed Cardella  
AT&T  
227 W. Monroe  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

This is an update to the March 10, 1997 letter. Analysis of all Ameritech offices has now been completed and this is the current information. You will notice some offices on the March 10 list have been removed. As a result of further analysis, we have determined we can provide your request in these offices.

Ameritech is providing an updated report of the inventory of offices where it is not technically feasible to meet AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform.

In the state of Indiana, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)
Indianapolis-Melrose	IPLSIN0163E	X	X
Indianapolis-Liberty	IPLSIN0254C	X	X
Indianapolis-Clifford	IPLSIN0425E	X	X
Indianapolis-Walnut	IPLSIN0692C	X	X
Indianapolis-State	IPLSIN0978C	X	X
Michigan City	MCCYIN0187C	X	X



All other offices are currently capable of providing the requested OS/DA routing. However, as stated previously in Ameritech's February 6 and March 10, 1997 letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition, as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time. As explained to you in the letter from Ray Thomas dated February 24 and stated again in the March 10 letter. Ameritech generally does not require a BFR for requests for custom routing in conjunction with ULS that involves 25 or less line class codes. Ameritech will advise you of any case with a custom routing request for ULS that is not technically feasible, or will require special construction.

As stated in your March 10 letter from me, should AT&T submit a BFR order for OS/DA routing to AT&T's OS/DA platform where an existing switch lacks the capacity or capability to provide the routing without software upgrades or construction of additional switching capacity, Ameritech will provide an estimate of the cost to undertake any technically feasible alternative made available by the specific switch vendor, short of complete switch replacement.

There are no additional costs with this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Joanne Missig".

Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill



April 3, 1997

Ed Cardella  
AT&T  
227 W. Monroe  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

This is an update to the March 10, 1997 letter. Analysis of all Ameritech offices has now been completed and this is the current information. You will notice some offices on the March 10 list have been removed. As a result of further analysis, we have determined we can provide your request in these offices.

Ameritech is providing an updated report of the inventory of offices where it is not technically feasible to meet AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform.

In the state of Michigan, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)
Brighton	BITNMIESDS0	X	
Dearborn-Oregon	DRBRMIORDS0	X	
Detroit-Bell	DTRTMIBHDS0	X	
Detroit-Madison	DTRTMIMDDS0	X	X
Detroit-Vinewood	DTRTMIVWDS0	X	
Farmington-Main	FRTNMIMNDS0	X	
Livonia-Main	LIVNMIMNDS0	X	



Monroe-Main	MONRMIMNDS0	X	
Mt. Clemens	MTCLMIMNDS0	X	
Northville	NRVLMIMNDS0	X	
Plymouth-Main	PLMOMIMNDS0	X	X
Pontiac-Main	PNTCMIMNDS0	X	
Port Huron-Main	PTHRMIMNDS1	X	
Romulus-Main	RMLSMIMNDS0	X	
Southfield-Main	SFLDMIMNDS0	X	X
Troy-Main	TROYMIMNDS0	X	X
Troy-Somerset	TROYMISMDS0	X	X
Warren-Main	WRRNMIMNDS0	X	
Ann Arbor-SE	ANARMISED0	X	
Flint-Main	FLNTMIMNDS1	X	X
Grand Rapids-East	GDRPMIESDS1	X	X
Highland Park-Townsend	HGPKMITSDS0	X	
Walled Lake-Main	WDLKMIMNDS0	X	X


All other offices are currently capable of providing the requested OS/DA routing. However, as stated previously in Ameritech's February 6 and March 10, 1997 letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition, as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time. As explained to you in the letter from Ray Thomas dated February 24 and stated again in the March 10 letter. Ameritech generally does not require a BFR for requests for custom routing in conjunction with ULS that involves 25 or less line class codes. Ameritech will advise you of any case with a custom routing request for ULS that is not technically feasible, or will require special construction.

As stated in your March 10 letter from me, should AT&T submit a BFR order for OS/DA routing to AT&T's OS/DA platform where an existing switch lacks the capacity or capability to provide the routing without software upgrades or construction of additional switching capacity, Ameritech will provide an estimate of the cost to undertake any technically feasible alternative made available by the specific switch vendor, short of complete switch replacement.

There are no additional costs with this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joanne Missig". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill



April 3, 1997

Ed Cardella  
AT&T  
227 W. Monroe  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

This is an update to the March 10, 1997 letter. Analysis of all Ameritech offices has now been completed and this is the current information. You will notice some offices on the March 10 list have been removed. As a result of further analysis, we have determined we can provide your request in these offices.

Ameritech is providing an updated report of the inventory of offices where it is not technically feasible to meet AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform.

In the state of Ohio, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)
--------	------	--	--

(NONE AT THIS TIME)

All other offices are currently capable of providing the requested OS/DA routing. However, as stated previously in Ameritech's February 6 and March 10, 1997 letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."



In addition , as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time. As explained to you in the letter from Ray Thomas dated February 24 and stated again in the March 10 letter. Ameritech generally does not require a BFR for requests for custom routing in conjunction with ULS that involves 25 or less line class codes. Ameritech will advise you of any case with a custom routing request for ULS that is not technically feasible, or will require special construction.

As stated in your March 10 letter from me, should AT&T submit a BFR order for OS/DA routing to AT&T's OS/DA platform where an existing switch lacks the capacity or capability to provide the routing without software upgrades or construction of additional switching capacity, Ameritech will provide an estimate of the cost to undertake any technically feasible alternative made available by the specific switch vendor, short of complete switch replacement.

There are no additional costs with this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.

  
Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill





April 3, 1997

Ed Cardella  
AT&T  
227 W. Monroe  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

This is an update to the March 10, 1997 letter. Analysis of all Ameritech offices has now been completed and this is the current information. You will notice some offices on the March 10 list have been removed. As a result of further analysis, we have determined we can provide your request in these offices.

Ameritech is providing an updated report of the inventory of offices where it is not technically feasible to meet AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform.

In the state of Wisconsin, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)
(NONE AT THIS TIME)			



All other offices are currently capable of providing the requested OS/DA routing. However, as stated previously in Ameritech's February 6 and March 10, 1997 letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition, as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time. As explained to you in the letter from Ray Thomas dated February 24 and stated again in the March 10 letter. Ameritech generally does not require a BFR for requests for custom routing in conjunction with ULS that involves 25 or less line class codes. Ameritech will advise you of any case with a custom routing request for ULS that is not technically feasible, or will require special construction.

As stated in your March 10 letter from me, should AT&T submit a BFR order for OS/DA routing to AT&T's OS/DA platform where an existing switch lacks the capacity or capability to provide the routing without software upgrades or construction of additional switching capacity, Ameritech will provide an estimate of the cost to undertake any technically feasible alternative made available by the specific switch vendor, short of complete switch replacement.

There are no additional costs with this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Joanne Missig".

Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill





May 8, 1997

Ed Cardella  
 AT&T  
 227 W. Monroe  
 Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

Per Ameritech's April 25, 1997 letter, here is a list of the offices where there are capacity limitations that prevent Ameritech from meeting AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform plus a listing of the limiting factor identified by the vendor and/or Ameritech for each office.

In the state of Illinois, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR. A listing of the limiting factor is found in the column at the far right.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)	Limiting Factor
Chicago-Calumet	CHCGILCADS1	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Chicago-Holboldt	CHCGILHBDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Chicago-Laramie	CHCGILLADS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Chicago-Monroe	CHCGILMODS1	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Chicago-OHare	CHCGILOHDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Chicago-Superior	CHCGILSUDS2	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Elk Grove	EVGVILEGDS1	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Joliet West	JOLTILJWDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Lombard	LBRDILLMDS1	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Lemont North	LEMTILLEDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
North Chicago	NHCILNCDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Roselle	RSLILLRZDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Wheaton	WHTNILWHDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Arlington Hts.	ARLHILAHDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*


Aurora-Main	AURRILARDS0	X	X	STDPRCTCT*
Barrington-S.	BNTOILAGDS0	X	X	STDPRCTCT*
Lockport	LCPTILLPDS0	X	X	STDPRCTCT*
Summit	SMMTILSMDS0	X	X	STDPRCTCT*

As stated previously in Ameritech's letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition, as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time.

\*Standard Pretranslator Control table

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.



Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill



May 8, 1997

Ed Cardella  
AT&T  
227 W. Monroe  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

Per Ameritech's April 25, 1997 letter, here is a list of the offices where there are capacity limitations that prevent Ameritech from meeting AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform plus a listing of the limiting factor identified by the vendor and/or Ameritech for each office.

In the state of Indiana, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR. A listing of the limiting factor is found in the column at the far right.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)	Limiting Factor
Indianapolis-Melrose	IPLSIN0163E	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Indianapolis-Liberty	IPLSIN0254C	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Indianapolis-Clifford	IPLSIN0425E	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Indianapolis-Walnut	IPLSIN0692C	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Indianapolis-State	IPLSIN0978C	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Michigan City	MCCYIN0187C	X	X	STDPRTCT*

As stated previously in Ameritech's letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition, as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time.

\*Standard Pretranslator Control table



If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.

  
Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill



May 8, 1997

Ed Cardella  
AT&T  
227 W. Monroe  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

Per Ameritech's April 25, 1997 letter, here is a list of the offices where there are capacity limitations that prevent Ameritech from meeting AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform plus a listing of the limiting factor identified by the vendor and/or Ameritech for each office.

In the state of Michigan, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR. A listing of the limiting factor is found in the column at the far right.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)	Limiting Factor
Brighton	BITNMIESDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Dearborn-Oregon	DRBRMIORDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Detroit-Bell	DTRTMIBHDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Detroit-Madison	DTRTMIMDDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Detroit-Vinewood	DTRTMIVWDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Farmington-Main	FRTNMIMNDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Livonia-Main	LIVNMIMNDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Monroe-Main	MONRMIMNDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Mt. Clemens	MTCLMIMNDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Northville	NRVLMIMNDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Plymouth-Main	PLMOMIMNDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Pontiac-Main	PNTCMIMNDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Port Huron-Main	PTHRMIMNDS1	X		STDPRTCT*
Romulus-Main	RMLSMIMNDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Southfield-Main	SFLDMIMNDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*






Troy-Main	TROYMIMNDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Troy-Somerset	TROYMISMDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Warren-Main	WRRNMIMNDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Ann Arbor-SE	ANARMISED0	X		STDPRTCT*
Flint-Main	FLNTMIMNDS1	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Grand Rapids-East	GDRPMIESDS1	X	X	STDPRTCT*
Highland Park-Townsend	HGPKMITSDS0	X		STDPRTCT*
Walled Lake-Main	WDLKMIMNDS0	X	X	STDPRTCT*

As stated previously in Ameritech's letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition , as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time.

\*Standard Pretranslator Control table

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.



Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill



May 8, 1997

Ed Cardella  
AT&T  
227 W. Monroe  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

Per Ameritech's April 25, 1997 letter, here is a list of the offices where there are capacity limitations that prevent Ameritech from meeting AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform plus a listing of the limiting factor identified by the vendor and/or Ameritech for each office.

In the state of Ohio, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR. A listing of the limiting factor is found in the column at the far right.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)	Limiting Factor
--------	------	--	--	--------------------


(NONE AT THIS TIME)

As stated previously in Ameritech's letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition, as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time.



If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joanne Missig". The signature is fluid and elegant, with the first name "Joanne" and last name "Missig" clearly distinguishable.

Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill



May 8, 1997

Ed Cardella  
AT&T  
227 W. Monroe  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Cardella:

Per Ameritech's April 25, 1997 letter, here is a list of the offices where there are capacity limitations that prevent Ameritech from meeting AT&T's request for routing of operator service and directory assistance (OS/DA) traffic originated by AT&T end user customers served by either resale or unbundled local switching to AT&T's OS/DA platform plus a listing of the limiting factor identified by the vendor and/or Ameritech for each office.

In the state of Wisconsin, these are the offices for which the routing option for Resale and/or Unbundled Local Switching (ULS) is currently not available based on AT&T's BFR. A listing of the limiting factor is found in the column at the far right.

Office	CLLI	Resale Incapable (significantly greater than 25 codes)	ULS Incapable (approximately 25 or less codes)	Limiting Factor
--------	------	--	--	--------------------

(NONE AT THIS TIME)

As stated previously in Ameritech's letters, "this availability analysis is valid at the time it is completed but line class code availability may increase or decrease in the future based on changes and circumstances in individual switches."

In addition, as stated in Ameritech's previous letters, AT&T may submit BFRs to order the routing of OS/DA traffic from AT&T end user customers served by Resale. Ameritech will verify the availability of codes at that time.



If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (810)443-9900 or by facsimile at (810)483-3738.

  
Joanne Missig  
Bona Fide Request Manager

cc: Bonnie Hemphill





**BEFORE THE  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

**Illinois Commerce Commission                    )**  
**On its own Motion                                )**  
**)**  
**Investigation concerning                        )**  
**Illinois Bell Telephone                         )**  
**Company's compliance with                     )**  
**Section 271(c) of the Telecom                 )**  
**munications Act of 1996                        )**

**96-0404**

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF DR. AUGUST H. ANKUM  
ON BEHALF OF MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION**

**Q.     PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

**A.     My name is Dr. August H. Ankum. I am an economist and consultant, specializing in telecommunications. My business address is 1350 North Wells, Suite C501, Chicago, IL 60610.**

**Q.     PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND WORK EXPERIENCE.**

**A.     I received a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Texas at Austin in 1992, an M.A. in Economics from the University of Texas at Austin in 1987, and a B.A. in Economics from Quincy College, Illinois, in 1982.**



My professional background includes work and consulting experiences in private industry, state regulatory agencies, and academia. As a consultant, I have worked with companies such as AT&T, MCI, Brooks Fiber and PCS providers. Before practicing as a consultant, I worked for MCI Telecommunications Corporation ("MCI") as a senior economist. At MCI, I provided expert witness testimony and conducted economic analyses for internal purposes. Prior to joining MCI in early 1995, I worked for Teleport Communications Group, Inc. ("TCG"), as a Manager in the Regulatory and External Affairs Division. In this capacity, I testified on behalf of TCG in proceedings concerning local exchange competition issues, such as Ameritech's Customer First proceeding in Illinois. From 1986 until early 1994, I was employed as an economist by the Public Utility Commission of Texas ("PUCT") where I worked on a variety of electric power and telecommunications issues. During my last year at the PUCT I held the position of chief economist. Prior to joining the PUCT, I taught undergraduate courses in economics as an Assistant Instructor at the University of Texas from 1984 to 1986.

Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY BEFORE THIS COMMISSION OR OTHER STATE COMMISSIONS?

A. Yes, I have. A list of proceedings in which I have filed testimony is attached to this testimony.